UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/720,608	11/24/2003	Joseph J. Massad	M3330.003 4237		
24118 7590 07/18/2007 HEAD, JOHNSON & KACHIGIAN 228 W 17TH PLACE			EXAMINER		
			WILSON, JOHN J		
TULSA, OK 74	4119		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		3732		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/18/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-
~ \
7,1
V

ĭ		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/720,608	MASSAD, JOSEPH J.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		John J. Wilson	3732			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apports. The Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLICATION OF THE MAILING DOMES OF THE MAI	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. (D) (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) 🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 July</u>	une 2007.				
	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)						
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-5,7 and 8</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	☑ Claim(s) <u>6 and 9-18</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Applicati	ion Papers					
	The specification is objected to by the Examine	or .				
	The drawing(s) filed on <u>06 June 2007</u> is/are: a		by the Examiner			
,,	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	•	, ,			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		•			
Priority u	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
	a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.				
	2	s have been received in Applicati	on No			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio	rity documents have been receive	ed in this National Stage			
	application from the International Burea					
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.			
Attachmen	t(s)					
	te of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F				
	r No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/6/07</u> .	6) Other:				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Claims 1-5, 7 and 8 stand withdrawn with traverse as being directed to nonelected inventions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In lines 10 and 11, "said occlusal surface of said special tooth" lacks proper antecedent basis with the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 6, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Laszlo (6608020). Laszlo teaches a tooth 4 provided with sides at 31, Figs. 2 and 3, resin filling, column 2, lines 39-42, which form an occlusal surface. Laszlo shows in the

Page 3

Art Unit: 3732

figures walls at 31 that have an inverse hour glass shape, the expanded bottom the shown walls inherently provides an undercut.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9, 11, 13, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Opotow (2309270) in view of Laszlo (6608020). Opotow shows a dental prosthesis 10 having teeth as shown, central bearing 12, removable attaching material 13. The shown central bearing is capable of being received in the mouth, page 2, column 1, lines 14-45, and is inherently capable of maintaining a spaced relationship. Opotow teaches the occlusion is adjusted, page 2, column 2, lines 7-25. The material 13 functions as an adhesive. Opotow does not show a tooth housing with a receptacle. Laszlo teaches a housing 31 having a receptacle. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Opotow to include a tooth housing as shown by Laszlo in order to better obtain the desired occlusion by an art known alternative method. As to claims 11 and 13, Laszlo teaches using resin for filling. To use resin for the tooth housing also would be an obvious matter of choice in the use of well known materials for teeth to one of ordinary skill in the art. The specific adhesive used is an obvious matter of choice in known materials for attaching devices to the skilled artisan.

Art Unit: 3732

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laszlo (6608020) in view of Faust et al (3826002). Laszlo shows the structure described above, however, does not show a removable insert. Faust shows a removable insert, Figs. 11-13. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Laszlo to include an insert as shown by Faust as the claim language is a list of elements properly met by a list of elements in the prior art.

Claim 15 is are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Opotow (2309270) in view of Laszlo (6608020) as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Faust et al (3826002). The above combination does not show a removable insert. Faust shows a removable insert, Figs. 11-13. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the above combination to include an insert as shown by Faust as the claim language is a list of elements properly met by a list of elements in the prior art.

Claim 17 is are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Opotow (2309270) in view of Laszlo (6608020) as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Luth (5188529). Opotow further shows a bearing plate 31 and bearing pin 22, however, the above combination does not show a lock nut. Luth teaches using a lock nut 11B. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the above

Art Unit: 3732

combination to include a lock nut as shown by Luth in order to lick the elements in position.

Drawings

The drawings submitted June 6, 2007 have been found to be acceptable by the examiner.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed June 6, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The newly applied reference to Laszlo '020 show an undercut as indicated above. Opotow is capable of being received in the mouth as described above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John J. Wilson whose telephone number is 571-272-4722). The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cris Rodriguez, can be reached at 571-272-4964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3732

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/John J Wilson/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 3732

jw July 10, 2007